



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ROCK HILL DIVISION

CLARENCE MARTIN,  
Plaintiff,

vs.

DALE KITTLES; CHARLES GROSE, JR.;  
and JUDGE MARTIN,  
Defendants.

§  
§  
§  
§ CIVIL ACTION NO. 0:07-2953-HFF-BM

---

---

ORDER

---

---

This case was filed as a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. Plaintiff is proceeding pro se. The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge, suggesting that this case be dismissed *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on September 18, 2007, and the Clerk of Court entered Plaintiff's objections to the Report on September 24, 2007.

For the Court to consider objections, the objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report to which the party objects and the basis for the objections. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). "Courts have . . . held de novo review to be unnecessary in . . . situations when a party makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate's proposed findings and recommendation." *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). In the absence of specific objections, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983).

Here, Plaintiff fails to state any specific objection to the Report. Instead, he asks the Court to order a transcript of a preliminary hearing in state court. These objections lack the specificity to trigger de novo review and will not be addressed. As stated by the Magistrate Judge, "[s]ince the plaintiff has failed to establish that his conviction has been reversed, expunged, or declared invalid by a state court, and no federal writ of habeas corpus has been issued, the action must be dismissed for failure to state a claim." (Report 3.)

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standard set forth above, the Court overrules Plaintiff's objections, adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of this Court that this case be **DISMISSED without prejudice** and without issuance and service of process.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Signed this 23rd day of January, 2008, in Spartanburg, South Carolina.

s/ Henry F. Floyd  
HENRY F. FLOYD  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

\*\*\*\*\*

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within 30 days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.